UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/480,701	01/07/2000	MAKOTO KOBAYASHI	12989-(JA998	4634

7590   09/15/2003

RICHARD L CATANIA ESQ
SCULLY SCOTT MURPHY & PRESSER
400 GARDEN CITY PLAZA
GARDEN CITY, NY   11530

EXAMINER
JAROENCHONWANIT, BUNJOB

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2143	

DATE MAILED: 09/15/2003

//

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

PPL

Office Action Summary	Application N . 09/480,701	Applicant(s) KOBAYASHI ET AL.
	Examiner Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit	Art Unit 2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _30 June 2003_ .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-11_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-11_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _8_ .

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code 102(e) and 103 (a) not included in this

action can be found in a prior Office action.

2.   Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Anupam et al (US. 6,411,989).

3.   As to claims 1, 3, 4, 9-11 Anupam discloses a method and apparatus (hereafter a system)

for sharing Web-top, i.e., shared web-page, browser, having a manager and a controller for

controlling browser in each of collaboration nodes, i.e., node manager, and each of the nodes

includes a surrogate, i.e., PageManager, for controlling, detecting changes of a shared web page,

sending the change to the controller(s) and/or receiving the changes from the controller.

Furthermore, Anupam discloses the surrogate is capable of detecting changes, e.g., user

interaction or URL changes, in the shared web page, communicating the changed between the

surrogate and the controller, i.e., sending/receiving changes between PageManager and

NodeManager (abstract fig. 2; Col. 3, line 40-Col. 4, line 18). Such teaching infers that the

means for detecting change and means for receiving changes are inherent; and wherein the

PageManager is embedded in each of said browser (browser 151 embedded with surrogate 153,

browser 171 embedded with surrogate 173, fig 1).

4.   As to claim 2, Anupam discloses a server 100 includes manager for control session

between collaborative browsers, controlling list of document to be reviewed by the perspective

collaborator, and displaying pages previously created to the new participant, visiting the

sequence URL to review its history, (Col. 3, lines 24-40; Col. 4, lines 33-67) e.g., computer U-N.

Such teaching infers that the page and changed pages are stored, e.g., cache in the server for later

presentation. Further, Anupam discloses the system using JAVA applet to create a surrogate in

each browser, i.e., the server embedding PageManager for controlling pages in each page.

5.   As to claim 5, Anupam discloses the surrogate periodically check the document structure

changes (Col. 5, lines 19-34; Col. 6, lines 8-40).

6.   As to claim 6, Anupam discloses the manager-controller located in the server (fig 2), i.e.,

independently form browsers, does not migrate, control communication including dynamically

generate and terminate session.

7.   As to claim 7, Anupam discloses the manager created lists of on going session, which

previously created by computer U-1, to be displayed or reviewed in a new participant computer

U-N, i.e., transition history of a page (Col. 3, lines 24-40; Col. 4, lines 33-53).

8.   Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anupam et al

(US. 6,411,989).

9.   Anupam discloses the invention substantially, as claimed, as described in claim 1,

including a PageManager is embedded as Java applets which have an identical domain and data

communication by shared memory is performed between said PageManager and said

NodeManager, e.g., a surrogate is a JAVA applet created for communicating with the controller

in the same domain. Anupam does not express that NodeManager is an embedded JAVA applet

embedded. Official Notice is taken (see MPEP 2144.03) JAVA applet and it advantage were

notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention was made. The JAVA has been

widely used in the art for simplifying software integration across plat form independent. Thus,

taking JAVA advantage by using the JAVA to created n applet or servlet to perform service

routines, e.g., a manager-controller, as suggested in Anupam would have obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made. Because creating the manager-

controller by JAVA applet, one ordinary skill in the art could enhance system flexibility and

efficiency with minimum complexity, designing time and cost, regardless of types of operating

system and computer platform.

10.   Applicant's arguments filed 6/30/03 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive. In the remark applicant argued in substance that the prior art does not teach the

principal of using the server to embedded the PageManager in the page. Examiner disagreed,

Anupam taught the concept of sharing web-top, e.g., browser and PageManager, e.g., Surrogate,

as discussed in the previous action and above claims' rejection. Previously, the examiner made

equivalent between the claimed PageManager and the taught Surrogate (see paragraph 3 above).

Applicant presented no argument to the equivalency. Further, Anupam also taught each browser

is embedded with the Surrogate, as amended.

11.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit whose telephone number is (703) 305-

9673. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-17:00.

         If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on (703) 308-5221. The fax phone numbers for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular

communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

         Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800.

/bj
September 10, 2003

BUNJOB JAROENCHONWANIT
PRIMARY EXAMINER